P76-98

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. (1897-98)

~~191~~ .

(L.R.)

File No. 77-4

Serial Nos. 1-11

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-11

In ~~Part~~ B for April 1899.

SUBJECT.

Registry of a building Site in the name of Yeliaki Limana of Naxos. Cycladis

Under Secretary

W D 1250—GPE—30,000—22-1-19

Indexed.

Plan.

Petition No. 267, 17-7-97
A.S. No. 74 & 97-98.

Petitioner Jayasinghe of
Avaragere
Kunigal taluk
Tumkur

Subject :-

Appeal against the
order of the Dy. Commr., Tumkur
District, No. 968, 30-4-97
granting a certain site in
Avaragere village to one
Yalakki Linga for build-
ing purposes

Facts of the case are :-

On 12-10-95 the
said Yalakki Linga put
in a petition to the Tahsildar
urging that a certain village
vacant site of Avaragere
had been in his enjoyment
for

Bounded on the
N by Sri Linga's vacant site
S - Rajappa Ramaiah's house
E - Gidduna Lakshmi's vacant
site.
W. - Venkatappa's vacant
site.

for a very long time, that
~~since~~ in spite of his enjoyment and
~~the~~ in spite also of a promise made
to him during the previous year
the site had remained unassessed
and unencumbered by his name.
He prayed that permission
might ~~may~~ be granted him to build a
house thereon and to pay the
Kandayam on it.

On the next day the Amildar
directed the Shekdar to report
how the matter stood.

The Shekdar delayed the
report called for for one year,
and on 2-11-96 ~~stated~~ replied
that the site referred to in the
above petition measured
6 x 10 ft; that some brinjal
plants had been grown on it.

The Amildar took objection
to the meagreness of the Shekdar's
report and directed him to
~~touch~~ on the following points:-

(1) What number ~~was~~ had been
given to the site in question and
what order had been passed regarding it.

(2) How far was it from

the

× N° 109, dt. 3-10-9

× N° 440

Exp

× N° 325, dt. 7-11-96

the dan Chastaru's house?

(3) How he had happened to enjoy it?

(4) How many years was it since he got possession of it.

In the meantime takkarus had come in against the grant of the site applied for by Yakkaki Timma. They are best understood by a reference to the sketch sub-mitted by the Sheristar. The portions marked A. & B form the site under dis-pute. The takkarudan for B is one Yakkaki, and for A one Javarayanda.

Yakkaki, counsel to the arzidar Timma, in his petn of 11-12-96 stated that he had in his possession and enjoyment (5½ × 10½ yds) had been inam hitherto by him for sloving manure, that it had been a hereditary land, & that Chikka Timma had

Paper 24 of the file.

Bounded on the
(— by - Road
= - Polyara Naiqa's house
3 - Venkatta's land
4 - Lakkanna's vacant site.

had fenced it in his absence and objected to his manure-storing. He prayed that the said land might be assessed and registered in his name.

The Amaldar from the village taken by the Sheristadar runs:— 9-12-96

One [x] not measured 8 x 8 yds [x] This is marked on the Sketch and contains manure, and the other (32 x 0 2 yds) the brinjal-plants. Yalaki, - the Arzidar Timma's Uncle's son, - had once stored manure on the spot where brinjals are grown now. Four years ago a quarrel arose between the said Yalaki and Timma which led to the former's ceasing to store the manure there. The distance between Timma's house and the site in question is over 200 yards. The site defined by Timma contains Basari-tree planted by Venkatappa. which causes-quently belongs to him. Timma's land containing brinjal-plants receives the [x] water of the [x] ground

[x] This is marked on the Sketch

[x] shaped Pan

Rajadhanipalli house."

Again, as regards Jawarayudu's
telegram
the portion marked A, one
Gidigapunnaiah Naga stated
that the said Jawara had
encroached upon his vacant
site and had begun to en-
-close the portion thus encroach
-ed upon by a stone-wall;
that the erection of the wall
had been arrested by him (Petr
that the said Jawara had also
unauthorizedly appropriated
a Basari tree situated between
two Govt vacant sites (shown
to be held by Sriyana Venkata
and Venkatayamma (Venkata
as well as the Site themselves
that the Petr was ready to
buy the said two sites if he
given away; & that the
said Jawarayudu, being a
man of influence, had
been trying to occupy all
those

Petr's Exhibit B-11-96
page 6.

Exhibit B-12-96

those lands some how or
other. He prayed that Jarma
might not be allowed to meddle
with his lands, and that
the said vacant Site be sold
in the presence of the Arbitrators.

~~In getting evidence of the case of~~ In trying to disprove the alle-
~~the charge brought~~ against him gations made
in the above petn, Jarmegowda
deposed before the Shekdar
as follows.—

There were
~~I am a~~ Family of 2
members. My present house
being found insufficient,
I obtained from Lakkanna*
a portion measuring 8×7½,
and bought from Venkata
of this village another portion
measuring 14×7. The wall
running round this square
area enclosed, also my own
land measuring 22×17. Sale
deeds too has been registered.
I did not appropriate Govt-land
unauthorizedly. Some of the
villagers have come in the
way.

*Brother of the above Lakkegowda, Son of his uncle Venkategowda.

way of my building the house. It is very inconvenient for me to have the doorway towards the east. I should like to have it towards the North only. In short the villagers have petitioned purposely to obstruct my extension of the business. I pray that no hindrance may be offered to my building the house."

In this Jawaya Lalla supported the brother of his opponent Lingya says:—

"My brother Lingya's statement relating to Jawaya's encroachment on his land ~~[illegible]~~ is not true. Jawaya requested me, and I gave him land measuring 5×2 yds. I have asked my brother not to obstruct and he has agreed to it. Foundation has been laid and wall raised thereon

When this fight for the portion marked A + B had been going on Yakkiki Linna, the original dachikaran was not quiet. He had repeatedly* petitioned the Mudaliar. So also had Yakkiki done. All these petitions had been sent to the Sheikdar for report.

* 1-1-90 + 15-12-96

No. 554

On 15-12-96 the Sheikdar reported that the vacant site in dispute had been given the No. 99, and measured according to vacant-site Statement 7 x 6 yds.; that a the villagers testified to the long enjoyment of the site by Yakkiki and to Linna possessed no dachikan with him, it was impossible for him to decide the suit, that there was no opportunity to deny Kandayan unless the claims were established in a competent Court; that with regard to the portion A, one Venkata had sold 4 x 7 yds of his land out of the adjoining vacant site C for £5 by Panneyandi, which contained the statement of Yakkiki; that the sale deed had been registered on 23-11-96; that Linna's

A measuring 8 x 8 and being a square plot
B, 5½ x 10½, being shown in it.

(a) that according to Yakkiki's deposition A-site belonged to one Venkata;

named Tarawa but this portion was also one that ought to be settled in a competent court; and that, judging from the state of the site Linga's enjoyment did not ~~become~~ clear appear to be true.

He further stated that Gowa Jawara did not seem to encroach upon Govt site as mentioned in Liyai's (Naigai's) Answer; that Banana tree ally to have been cut by him (Jawara) was not a Govt tree; that the man who planted it was one Kaikaregowda who was Jawara's uncle; that the tree as well as the measure put had been in the enjoyment of Lankanna (Kaikaregowda's son) until it was given to Jawara; that the tree had not been cut; that all Site except D were Kaikari-Site; that Linga had no dwelling house near this Site; that the land No 69 in the name of Jawaregowda

meaning

× Liyai's Site is marked E in the Sketch.

Note D is the Sugar cane plantation of Jawara which is disputed by Govt.

measuring 17 x 17 yds had a
kandagam of 8/4; that the
Site as shown in the sketch had
a compound wall* round it which
enclosed the site obtained from
Venkata and Lakkanna; that
to the E + N, the black line
represented the house walls of
the ryots; that of all the ryots
Jawaregowda was the one who
possessed the largest family, and
consequently was the one who
needed more site; that the
takrars seemed to have been
raised chiefly to prevent Jawara
from acquiring more site, & that
as there was no encroachment
upon Govt site there was no
reason to preclude him from
raising the wall.

Along with the above report
the Shekdar submitted a Copy
of Vacant-Site Takhta.

A petition of Lakkie-
Linna, dy 15-12-96, states that
when the Vacant Site Statement
was prepared in 1893-94, the
Shanbhog

* 2, 3 to 7 ft-high
coloured red.

Shanbhag did not measure the whole site fully; that this inaccuracy was found out subsequently during the time of Jamabandi, when he applied for a full and correct measurement and also gave a undertaking to the effect that he would pay a Kandayam of $8/2$; that further when he ~~offered~~ offered to pay the Kandayam to the Shanbhag the latter would not accept it as he had not at that time received any order to that effect; that the Shekdar once measured his land (A) correctly into 7x8 yds and recommended his case for favourable consideration, but, on another occasion he measured it differently and reported against him. He prayed that his piece of land may be confirmed to him.

Thereafter the Collector himself took up the enquiry, and on 24-12-96 depositions of the following persons were taken

taken*

(1) Yadaraki Linna

(2) Javaregonda

(3) Giddana Venkata.

(4) Venkategonda (Venkategowda's son)

(5) Gangaregonda - Patel.

(6) Ninga (Linga)

vide papers 13 - 18 in the file.

On 31-12-96 the amount of Kunigal reported* as follows* in the late Amildar's assessment* in the Revenue Statement* thus:- No 962 * 85 11 94

"In accordance with the orders passed* year before last* (i.e. 1894)- directing the fixing of assessment on all hakdari- vacant- sites, a classification of lands was effected into hakdari and Sarkari. As regards the following 5 village-sites belonging to Aragere, the particulars are:-

No 69 - Javaregonda - 17 x 17. in extent

" 99 - Yadaraki Linna - 7 x 6.

" 100 - Giddana Venkata - 7 x 6.

" 101 - Venkategonda - 8 x 8.

" 102 - Ninga ——— 8 x 8.

~~Vacant sites assessed at Rs 1 each.~~

Of these sites No 69 of Javara is un- attached to any house. It is a Hulla-Koppara land. He consent-

to pay its price. Sight-lines has been charged on it. Do others consent to pay the price on similar tracts? - Inquire

Now on 13-10-95 Valakki-Timma Nirvanadar of No 99 petitioned urging that, on receipt of Kandayam from him, permission might be granted him to build house thereon. The Sheristadar then sent his meagre report which was taken objection to. And then followed his detailed report No 554, dt 19-12-96. In that report which was accompanied by a sketch showing the said 5 sites, he stated that the B-portion of No 99 of Valakki Timma had been fenced round and contained brinjal-plants. That the A-portion had been sold by Lakka, the said Timma's son, to Javaregowda, the holder of site No 69. That likewise sites Nos 100 & 101 had been sold to the same Javaregowda by their respective holders; that the

the said Jaivanna had built
Compound wall around all
these sites ~~as~~ etc.. Subsequent
to ~~the receiving~~ the report, Gyanni
Linnaa complained that the
shekdar had been wrong. I then
went to the village on 26th inst,
and personally inspected site
by site in presence of the holders
the Shekdar the patel, the Bhan-
-dhoge + the said Jaivantrao
(was found
to have enclosed within his Compound
wall what is alleged to be his
own Hulla-kolpala, and also
what he is said to have pur-
-chased from other. The progress
of the wall has been arrested
on Gyanni Linnaa's takrar.
One only of these 5 Jaivantrao
has his land assessed at present.
In consideration of the late
Amildar's order (quoted in the
beginning of this report) enquiring
to know if, with the exception
of one, the rest were willing
of the holders.
to pay the price of their Hull
-kolpals, as a means of having
their

their rights confirmed, and in consideration also of the fact that sales have been effected by the parties prior to such a confirmation and grant of pattas, the shekdar write that the matter is of a civil-nature. This is mistake. The shekdar has said in his first report that Yalakki Timma's site measures 6×16 yds. He has stated divided the same into A+B in his second report, of which the former site has been said to be the one under dispute. This difference between the 1st and 2nd report has passed off, I think, unnoticed by him. Consequently, this unnecessary takarar has been caused.

Now, in my personal inspection I have determined the extent of their respective holdings-kaipalu thus:

1. 1st log of Parameshwara - Correct extent } 17×17 = 289
   — excess - 4×17 = 68
   Total — 357.

Send the D keeper

2. No 99 - Yalakkiamma - correct 7 x 6 = 42 (4-points)

Excess $10\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2} = 57\frac{3}{4}$ (Points cut off initially)

Total — $99\frac{3}{4}$ sq yds

The whole of this $99\frac{3}{4}$ sq yds has been mentioned to belong to Yalakki Yamma. But Gidda Venkata states that he sold 42 sq yds of the to Jaramgonda as the same has belonged to his No 100. We cannot determine by the "list" that the said portion was belonged to him. It is to be supposed that he sold it for the sake of existing takaran. Moreover all the ryots state that this land was been owned by the takaradar Yalakki Yamma.

× had been included in his.

3. No 100. Gidda Venkata - correct 7 x 6 = 42 sq yds

~~Adopted to have been sold~~ sold by him to Jaramgonda -

4. No 101 - Venkatagonda - correct 8 x 8 = 64 sq yds

~~adopted to have been~~ sold by him to Jaramgonda.

5. No 102. Naga - correct 8 x 8 = 64 sq yds

No talkan about this. Contains bringals.

The D- site to the south× of this measures $2\frac{1}{2} \times 5 = 12\frac{1}{2}$ sq yds, and is a Govt- waste.

× North (?)

to the above correct area have

by the villagers

have been [Land] to belong to the
hutch-holders of these respective
holders, and as they are
distant from their houses and
do not form backyards, and
as formerly the tenants
agree to pay the price of
the sites that are determined
to belong to them ~~respectively~~ severally
recommend that the said
sites may be given away
at 3 pies per sq yd (the usual
rate in those parts), and that,
on receipt of the amount,
the same be accepted."

The Collector further re-
ported, in connection with the
delay of 1 year caused by
the Sheristadar in submitting
his report, that it was
this delay that gave the
parties an opportunity to
effect nominal sale, a
power

proved by the fact that the sale deed effected between Jivana and Venkata has been dated 23-11-96; that the sale had been effected with the malicious intention of dispossessing Yacoobi Lianna of a portion of his site, & that the sale was not a valid one on account of its being made by persons who had not had their titles to the lands recognized before they sold them &- they having not paid any rent-site Kandayam, & the prices of those sites, in the meantime.

Whereupon the Assistant Agent ordered the Arbitrator to decide as he thought best, so that those that were not satisfied with the decision might appeal with it. N° 76, 23-1-97

Then the Arbitrator wrote that the Assistant Agent's permission was essential to collect the price * N° 109, 24-1-97

price of site and settle the question.

×No 829, d 8-3-97

And then the District order× was sent, to the Auditor stating that as he had included the names of three different persons in the correspondence it was inconvenient to pass orders; that if the correspondence relating to each of them were sent separately, then separate orders would be passed on each of them on its own merits and that the case of the Sheridan required a separate report.

On 24-3-97 the Auditor justified himself by stating that he saw no necessity to separate the records like that, as they had formed the correspondence related to the recovery of price the value of site as sanctioned originally in the statement, as the ownership of sites was also a settled question

question; & also the Sheristadar's letter received in connection with this matter. He further remarked that all the talkarar that now existed was with regard to Yalamanchi Timma's site & that the rest were old Vaisya talkarar.

No 903, d 29-3-97

Whereupon with the Dist. Order ran as follows:-

"In your first report you stated that Jaramgowda of Site No 69, purchased a portion of Site No 69 from Timma Nuclesan, Yalanki; and in this report you state that the said portion had belonged to one Venkata. What is the reason for this discrepancy"?

The Amildar pointed out that there has been no such discrepancy, & that that portion of his report declaring that the site had belonged to Siddanna Venkata, and that it was from this Siddanna Venkata & not from Yalanki that Jaramma had purchased the site had been underlined with a red-pencil.

page 6 of the record

No 963, 30-4-97

On the 1st issue order as follows:

"The grant of Sites Nos 69, 99, 100, 101, 402, mentioned in the report, to their respective owners for reasonable price is sanctioned of any one should have any claim against this, let him dispute it in a competent Court".

Against this order the plaintiff appealed to Court on 17-7-97 on the grounds, (1) that the sale-deed in his possession was given no respect to, that the fact of his having stored manure on A was sufficient to establish his right to it, (3) that the defendant had failed to establish in any way his right, possession or enjoyment of the disputed site A; (4) that the

in the judgment

by

Gr[illegible] under was against
the weight of words, the sale-deed
and the right of possession.

Their petition was forwarded on 11-8-97
together with its enclosures[x] to
the R[illegible] for report.

3 in number
in stead
(2) - Sale-deed
(3) Deed of gift
of 1865

The Collector was thereupon
directed[x] to submit the records
with a full report on the grounds
urged in the appeal-petition.
He states with ~~reference~~ regard to ~~grounds~~
grounds (1) of the appeal-petn:

N° 109, dt 13-8-97

that the appellant Savarimuthu
had no right- of possession, ~~with regard~~ + enjoyment
to A-site; that the sale-deed was
effected during the unnecessary
delay caused by the Collector;
that the mere fact that
a sale-deed was written out
in his name did not give
him any hak over the said
site; that the villagers had
objected to the effect that the A-site
and the manure collected there
belonged to Palakkiruma Gr[illegible];
that this fact was clear from
the depositions of Gopiama
Venkata and Patel Singamma;
and

And that it was clear therefore that Jawaregowda had no claim whatever for site ~~as~~ marked A;—

found (2) - ~~And that~~ that the Applicant had not shown that the manure had ~~belonged~~ been stored by him; that Giddana Venkata and the villagers had all said that the manure belonged to Sulla Timma ;—

found (3) ~~-~~ that the late Amildar had remarked in the year Jaya (in the statement then prepared) that the A-site belonged to Gyalakki Timma; & that the same fact had been verified during the present Amildar's enquiry, of 26-12-

The Amildar in the end recommended that the whole site No 99 comprising of A + B may be given away to Gyalakki Timma on receipt from th of its value, and on the fixing of assessment.

On the receipt of the above report Memo of the Accountant Gen. sent his report to the Govt. in which he observes:—

"Petitioner Jarave pruda lays claim to Site A on the ground of his having purchased it from Venkata Rajulu of Site No C on the Sketch, on 22nd November 1896. This sale cannot affect the entry in the Revenue Accounts. If Petitioner thinks he is entitled to Site A he is at liberty to establish his claim in a Civil Suit

P 650, 8 7-1-98.

Note- Difference between the Track Sketch and Appellant's Sketch is as shown below:—

Track Sketch		Appellant's Sketch
A	=	B
C	=	a
B	=	D
D	=	C

17/8/98

The dispute relates to the owne
ship of plot A in the latter Sketch
(v. no 26 in the V Records) The
portion as saw to measure
7 x 6042 9 3rd

= The appellant claims this
as the vendee of the site from
Venkatisooda while the
respondent claims it by
virtue of long possession &
enjoyment & is supported in
his claim by the Mahazar
of the 1905

= The records leave no (moral)
doubt that the Shekdar
gave the appellant a lease
of one year to have the sale-
deed prepared and that
the appellant who seems to
be a man of influence seems to
have been bringing up "claims" which
the vendors do not find
convenient to defend/prosecute.
The Neither the Dis comm nor the
Asst has found
(1) Who had possession of the
site in dispute

(2) That are the claims
Ventilate Grada - the protection
in title or the application - to the
Sale

The auth has indeed said in his
report that the division falls"
does not enable him to
discuss the 2nd question

19/3/98

Portion illegible
illegible illegible
21/3/98

Portion illegible

First Counsel's query on the above
" When there are questions
(raised) of title founded on
possession - the dispute
really is inter partes,

what right has the Govt or Govt to adjudicate upon such rights & under what law or procedure is the price of the lots in possession of different parties fixed by revenue authority & the grant sanctioned ? "

= sanctioned ?

(A) Under sec 48 r/w sec 137(2)(b) of the R Code assessment is leviable on building lots and under sec 136 existing occupancy rights are declared to be confirmed In (implied) exercise of the power granted by sec 48 & 137(2)(b) of the Code, G.O. No 16919-27 R1699 6/4/94 (copy put up) was passed directing all holders of

X affirmed ?
(cancel)

Subs: The idea of "lease" does not seem to be implied in "appropriated" At any rate it is not implied in clause (a) "land appropriated for purposes of agriculture"
9/6/98

Subs: Govt have the power to make such a rule under Clause (x) of sec 233 of the Code. I understand a proposal is under consideration (in Rev Branch) among other things to amend this

Subs: Govt have the power to make such a rule under Clause (x) of sec 233 of the Code. I understand a proposal is under consideration (in Rev Branch) among other things to amend this

building site to pay "a
fair assessment" on them

It is in the carrying out
of this order that appeals
like the present have
been cropping up

As regards the present case
the question before the
D Comm^r was who was
to be registered as the
occupant of the building
site in dispute for the
payment of the assessment.

When the respondent Irmina
was recognized as the owner/occupant
the D Comm^r was not justified
in levying a price for the
site. In a similar case, x this will be put dfs d[illegible]
the mistake was pointed out
by the D Comm^r = the D Comm^r is disposing of good building site
The registry of the building site
in the name of the respondent
is anomalous to the registry

Vide dockets 1097 p 131.
24th July 1911
the reference
[illegible]

135

of a ~~registry~~ survey number
at the survey settlement
There is nothing to prevent
the appellant from
establishing his claim to
the site as against the
respondent in a civil
court - under clause (b)
of Sec^n 222 of the LR Code

The only other course would
be to refuse to register
~~either~~ the site in the
names of either party & to
refer the parties to a
civil suit. in the form 2 part 2
of Rule XXV of the LR Rules

MJ 7/6/98

Why shd
Asst Comm
in a case
like this

AH
7.6.98

Subd: The assessment
has been fixed & must
be levied from somebody
who is prima facie the
occupant

MJ 9/6/98

Seen
AH
9/6/98

P.T.O.

In Govt Pro No $\frac{551-8}{F.76-98}$ 20/7/98

the case was remanded to the Dy C^r for disposal Under Sec XXX A of the L. R. Rules the Dy. C^r confirmed the sale to Galakki Jimma and directed the appellt to establish his claim, if any, in a competent court. Jawan Gauda has again appealed to Govt against this order.

Bbn
14/3.

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 74 of 1897-98
A.S. No. 14 of 98-99

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Javare Ganda of Avaregere Kunigal Taluk		Igalaki Linga of the same village.

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commr of Tumkur rejecting Appellant's claim to a building site at Avaregere.

Notice to the 20th June
Sd/ 4th Committee Proceedings

Result of 1st Committee
Sd/ 4/6/98
Sd/ 22/6/98

Sd/ 4/6/98

4th Committee
Sd/ 7/6/98

Sd/ 7/6/98

Sd/ 7/6/98



Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur, dated 30-4-97.

1897 A.S. No. 2467

267

Name of Petitioner	Jamire gaund
Village	Amjegere
Taluk	Kunigal
District	Tumkur
Date of Arzi	17-7-97
Date of Receipt	23-7-97
Date of Disposal	
No. of Enclosure	Three.

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur in his No. 963 dated 30-4-97, in the matter of certain sites applied for by

No. 963. to the Amildar, Kunigal, dated 13-4-97 (No. 1168) regarding the fixing of boundaries of sites Nos. 69, 70, 71 and 72 in accordance with the proposal of the Amildar in his report dated 13-4-97 (No. 1168) regarding the fixing of boundaries of sites Nos. 69, 70, 71 and 72 in accordance with the respective owners of the said sites. The petitioner has no objection to the boundaries as fixed by the Amildar, but he has some objection to the boundaries as fixed by the Amildar, but he has some objection to the boundaries as fixed by the Amildar, but he has some

Pet. submits a rough sketch of the lands in his possession enjoyment. (Nos. A, a, b, and C that the portion (site) marked and the site marked a, are in his enjoyment; that the site b was bought by him the pety.) from one Venkatagowda on Nov. 96 (a copy registered document hereto annexed); that the complainant & one Gowda claiming the site b as his the Saluka Muldas effected against the pety. without enquiring into the real ownership and without examining the records; that the Dy. Comr. on appeal reversed the order appealed against declaring that the site belongs to the Saluka Muldas and not to the pety. and accordingly

Grounds are -

1) The sale deed by Venkatagowda of the site b duly registered and the long enjoyment of the pety.

2) The fact that the pety. having has stored manure etc in the land b undisputed is a sufficient evidence of the petitioner's possession.

3) That the Gowda-petitioner Gabal Chikkagowda has produced no records in his favour warranting the removal of his right of possession and enjoyment.

4) That the order appealed against is against the weight of the records and rights of possession etc.

26/7/37.

267

A. S. No 74 of 1897-98.

ہے کہ اس کے ساتھ ہی ایک اور مسئلہ بھی حل ہو جاتا ہے۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو زاویے برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر زاویوں کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو زاویے برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو زاویے برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو اضلاع برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر اضلاع کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو اضلاع برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو اضلاع برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین اضلاع برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر اضلاع کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو اضلاع برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین اضلاع برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین زاویے برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر زاویوں کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو زاویے برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین زاویے برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو اضلاع برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر اضلاع کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو اضلاع برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے دو اضلاع برابر ہوں تو ان کے مقابل زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین اضلاع برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر اضلاع کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو اضلاع برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین اضلاع برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں زاویے بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

اب ہم ایک اور مسئلہ ثابت کرتے ہیں۔ یہ مسئلہ ہے کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین زاویے برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس کا ثبوت یہ ہے کہ اگر ہم مثلث کو اس کے برابر زاویوں کے درمیان سے دو حصوں میں تقسیم کر دیں تو ہمیں دو مثلثیں ملیں گی جن کا ایک ضلع مشترک ہے اور دو زاویے برابر ہیں۔ پس ان کے باقی اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔ اس طرح ہم نے ثابت کر دیا کہ اگر ایک مثلث کے تین زاویے برابر ہوں تو اس کے تینوں اضلاع بھی برابر ہوں گے۔

Dels. 225 ✓ 11-8-97

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT. (2)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition Registered No. 267 dated 17-7-97. received at the Dewan's Office from in favour of Gowda, Manager village, Tumkur Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr., Tumkur Dt., No. 963 dated 30-4-97 in the matter of certain site

CR 77-97

is forwarded, together with its three enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District for a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned.

By order,

BANGALORE, Chief Secretary.

11 July 97

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

15-1-98

Rept [illegible]

AK
18/1/98
Submit
[illegible]
19-1-98

Prem (circ)
My 24/1/98

ex [illegible]
[illegible]
25.1.98

Note- The petition was not
prepared by Mr. P.C. as he
was [illegible] ill. My 18/2/98

Rec'd 18/3/98
Mk

Submit Legal Consultant
prem (The delay in this case
is due to the fact of the following
been sent to Mr Kamlaraj who for
being removed & retd. on 1/3/98)

My 19/3/98

R37.30pm
19.3.98

[illegible]

Cr 77-97 3

General Serial No. 30.) 5058
E1.86

1897-98 (3)

From The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District.

To The Secretary to
the Govt of Mysore, Legal
& Rev. Depts. —

Dated 7th January 1898
Despatched 10th January 1898
Received

Enclosures No. 4 and A Vernacular

General No. 65 C.
No.

Copies of my official memo
225 dated the 7th January 1898

—o—

Reporting on the
petition of one Ganga-
-pandaiya of the Amrapura
Agraharam in the Tumkur
Taluk

Rec'd P.C. [illegible]
7-1-98

Rec'd
17/1

Central Jail Press, Bangalore.—6-3-97.—10,002.

No 650
Rec: 4/ record

Deputy Commissioner's office
Tumkur district
Tumkur 7th January 1898.

To.

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore. General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your official Memo No 225 dated the 11th August 1897, calling for report upon a petition presented by one Javare gowda of the Amrapore village in the Kunigal Taluk, appealing against the entry of a building site in the name of Yalakki Thimma, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire record in the case, and to invite attention to the sketch of the site in question. Paper No: 26. The portion marked A on the Sketch is the site in dispute. This site together with the one marked B was entered in the list of vacant building sites prepared in 1894-95. as belonging to one Yalakki Thimma on the ground of long possession as ascertained from local enquiry and certified to by the

villagers

villagers, and were finally ordered to be made over to him on payment of a price. Vide my order 13:963 dated 30th April 1901. Petitioner Jeeraj pleads a legal claim to site A on the ground of his having purchased it from Venkata, holder of site 13C on the Sketch, on 22nd November 1896. This Sale cannot affect the entry in the Revenue accounts. If Petitioner thinks he is entitled to site A, he is at liberty to establish his claim in a Civil Suit.

2. The petition under reply is hereunto returned.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

A Mahadmanya

for Deputy Commissioner

ek

LR 77-97-G

2 drafts

(5)

Proceedings of the Court of Mysore

Appellant Jivaregonda
vs Gaddeke Timma

Read:-

(1) Petition of appeal No 74 of 1897-98 presented by Jivaregonda of Jivaregere, Kunigal Taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commr of Tumkur rejecting the appellant's claim to a building site at Jivaregere

(2) Letter No 650-97 January 1898 from the Dy Commr Tumkur dt 7th reporting that the site in question (marked A on the sketch) together with the adjacent one was entered in the list of vacant building sites prepared in 1894-95 as belonging to respondent Gaddeke Timma on the ground of long possession as ascertained by local enquiry and certified to by the villagers, and was finally ordered to be made over to him on payment of a fee; that appellant Jivaregonda lays claim to site A on the

1) Draft to be approved

2) Docket-No 1097 dt 24/7/97
P/31
in which the decision was appealed against. No upset price can be levied on private buildings. Only is ground rent to be charged.

3) The order may be communicated to the Dy Comr

Sd/- C. E. S.

11/7/98

Yes
11/7/98

Sd/- G. K. Commr

15/7/98

9303

for approval

15. 7. 98

ground of his having purchased it from one Venkata in Nov/96, and that his sale cannot affect the entry in the Revenue accounts

(3.) Records of the case received with the above letter

Cordes - R. $\frac{537-8}{P.70-98}$ $\frac{2}{21}$ 5.98

Govt observe that the Dy. Commr has recorded no finding in this case as to whether the site in question is a Govt waste land or belongs to a private individual. If Venkiki Amma has acquired a right of occupancy to the site as against Govt under Sec: 130 of the Land Rev: Code, the Dy Commr ~~is~~ was not justified in levying a price for the same. For the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of G.O. No $\frac{16919-27}{R\ 1699}$ dt 6th April /94 in ~~this~~ Indra case, the Dy Commr had simply to ascertain by

by a summary enquiry the person in actual possession and register the title in his name for levying the assessment thereon. If on the other hand the Dy Commr finds the title to be in the person of the applicant and not in the benefit occupation of any Govt waste land, he is competent to dispose of the same under Sec 155 of the A.R. Code and the rules thereunder.

2. The case is remanded to the Dy Commr for disposal in the light of the above remarks.

3. ~~In the main paper the appellant~~ X ~~claimed a declaration~~ in this case the plaintiff-applicant has not ~~filed a suit~~, Govt consider that Dy Commrs and other revenue officers should in their orders refer to the provisions of law under which they are acting

Secretary

To Dy Commr Tumkur
with records

By order &c
Secretary

D.O.
11

Sub^e for approval

Approved
14/7/1898

Govt appln appeal in this
& Tumkur Dy Com^r

15.7.98

+Press copy put up on 22-7-98

(5)

1898-99

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

July 1898

No. 551-8
PET. F. 6-98

Passing orders on the appeal of Javaregauda of Avaregere, Kunigal taluk, regarding a building site claimed by him, and directing that Deputy Commissioners and other Revenue officers should in their orders invariably refer to the law under which they are acting.

MGCPB—19-8-98—120

Appellant.	*Vs.*	*Respondent.*
Javaregauda.		Yalakki Timma.

READ—

(1) Petition of Appeal No. 74 of 1897-98 presented by Javaregauda of Avaregere, Kunigal taluk, against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur rejecting the appellant's claim to a building site at Avaregere.

(2) Letter No. 659, dated 7th January 1898, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district, reporting that the site in question (marked A on the sketch) together with the adjacent one was entered in the list of vacant building sites prepared in 1894-95 as belonging to respondent Yalakki Timma on the ground of long possession as ascertained by local enquiry and certified to by the villagers, and was finally ordered to be made over to him on payment of a price; that appellant Javaregauda lays claim to site A on the ground of his having purchased it from one Venkata in November 1896; and that this sale cannot effect the entry in the revenue accounts.

(3) Records of the case received with the above letter.

No. 551-3—Pet. F. 6-98, dated Bangalore, 20th July 1898.

Order thereon.—Government observe that the Deputy Commissioner has recorded no finding in this case as to whether the site in question is a Government waste land or belongs to a private individual. If Yalakki Timma has acquired a right of occupancy to the site as against Government under Section 136 of the Land Revenue Code, the Deputy Commissioner is not justified in levying a price for the same. For the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of Government Order No. 16919-27—R. 1699, dated 6th April 1894, in such a case, the Deputy Commissioner has simply to ascertain by a summary enquiry the person in actual possession and register the site in his name for levying the assessment thereon. If on the other hand the Deputy Commissioner finds the site to be the property of Government and not in the lawful occupation of any person, he is competent to dispose of the same under Section 135 of the Land Revenue Code and the rules thereunder.

2. The case is remanded to the Deputy Commissioner for disposal in the light of the above remarks.

3. In the order passed by the Deputy Commissioner in this case the law applicable to it has not been quoted. Government consider that Deputy Commissioners and other Revenue officers should in their orders invariably refer to the provisions of the law under which they are acting.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, with records.
The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

Exd.—C.V.

(4) [illegible] 267 A.S.74 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

ಕೈಜಿಸಿದವರಿಗಾಗಿ ಇಲಿಂಸಲ್ಲಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

By Order

For Secretary

14/7/98

ಮೇಲಿನ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ ಸದರಿ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ.

ಆದರೆ.

By Order

14-7-98

For Secretary.

7/98

14/7/98

A 77-97-6 (6)

1898

341 Arzi No. 97-98

Name of Petitioner Jinnappa

Village Annappa

Taluk Kundapur

District Dharwar

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 9-8-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 3

Refer
17.8.98
Rec-1878/98
267877 C.Z. 6-8-98.
Engd
1875/98
07 6 98 relating to the
matter.

AK
10/8/98.
Subd
1/2 Rs stamp affixed - stamp duty.
(2) The deft Nanna under complained of
duly 5.8.98 — in time
mdy
19.8.98
(3) appeal against Dy Comm's
order from the case remanded
by Govt 537-8 dt 20/7/98
PF 6-98
4) Connected case
Subd Rec'd CYE Dy
23/8/98
Rec'd 7/Nan
23-8-98
284
Subd 25/8/98
24/9/98
9681 For a day,
in view
to fix

ABSTRACT

Appeals against order-sheet dt. 5th June
passed in Case No. 21 of 5-97-98 which
is follows:-

The respondent applied to partition
the joint property in Sy No. 99 of Annappa
village, Kundapur taluk from the applicant
& Govt No. Sy No. 551-8 ~~contained~~
6-98
of 23-7-98 was passed from the Deputy Co-
operative Officer, Kundapur, partitioning
the land as follows.

While applicant was given to hot over
1099-27 of 0-27 cents in
R 1099 out of the said joint land in the village, Sy No.
99 of Annappa village, Kundapur taluk
in favour of the respondent, while
Nanna - Which was retained by the

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Counter petition - the Petitioner's learned
Advocate - Sri [illegible] submitted that
the petitioner is entitled to the
relief asked for.

7. From the perusing of the Dy. Comm's order
it is seen that Commissioner has in the matter
of fixing the fair rent of the petitioner has
considered the principles laid down by the Code
and the Ceiling Act. It is seen that
the petitioner has not filed
any objection.

8. The Dy. Comm's decision is not by
law, it is legal and against the principles of
fact. It cannot be the case that
the petitioner is entitled to relief.

Respondent's Counsel Sri [illegible]
contending that the Ceiling Officer
Ceiling Act is applicable.

Enclosures

1. Dy. Comm's Enst No. 21/95-A-96
2. Copy of Govt. Rep. No. 581-C/Rel-7-6-98 dt 20-7-98
3. Hon'ble Enst No. 267 dt 15-7-98

HK
15/8/98

In passing the reversed order,
the Dy Comm has not
found clearly whether under
Sec 136 of the KR Code Galakki
Timma has acquired a
right of occupancy. Rule XXXA
applies only to sale at the
disposal of Govt & not in the case of
occupation of anybody. 23/8/98



PAYABLE AT PAR WHEN PRESENTED
AT ANY OF THE BRANCHES
NO. 341R
DATE 9-8-98

Revenue Stamps affixed Mfg

Mahbubnagar
9.8.98
Mfg

99
1898 14.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕಂದಾಯ/ಭೂಮಿ/೨೦೨೩/೧೪೭

ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೨-೦೪-೨೦೨೩

ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ

ವಿಷಯ: ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ತೆರವು ಕುರಿತು.

ಎಲ್ಲಾ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯನ್ನು ತೆರವುಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹಲವು ಬಾರಿ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ನೀಡಲಾಗಿದ್ದರೂ ಸಹ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿರುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಈ ಕುರಿತು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಹಾಗೂ ಜನಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿಂದ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ದೂರುಗಳು ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಈ ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ, ತಮ್ಮ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳ ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸಿ, ಒತ್ತುವರಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ನೋಟಿಸ್ ನೀಡಿ, ಒತ್ತುವರಿಯನ್ನು ತೆರವುಗೊಳಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ತೆರವು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯ ಪ್ರಗತಿ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ೫ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನೊಳಗೆ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಚೇರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಒತ್ತುವರಿ ತೆರವು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೇ ರೀತಿಯ ನಿರ್ಲಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಅಥವಾ ವಿಳಂಬ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ, ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗುವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ.

ಸಹಿ/-
ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು
ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ

ಪ್ರತಿ:
೧. ಹೊಸದುರ್ಗ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೨. ಚಳ್ಳಕೆರೆ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೩. ಹಿರಿಯೂರು ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೪. ಮೊಳಕಾಲ್ಮೂರು ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೫. ಹೊಳಲ್ಕೆರೆ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೬. ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ ತಹಸೀಲ್ದಾರರು
೭. ಉಪವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗ
೮. ಉಪವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು, ಹಿರಿಯೂರು
೯. ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ವೇಕ್ಷಣಾ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು
೧೦. ಕಡತ

(41)

12-9-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

1877-97-8

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 341 dated ~~in these~~ date received on 9.8.98 at the Dewan's Office from Javare gowda & others of village in the Kunigal appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr Dunkur regarding certain site in Hvaragere village granted to one Yalakki Dimma for building purposes

is forwarded, together with its three enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Dunkur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, ~~together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.~~

2. The petition with its enclosures should be returned

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

10/8/1898

12/9

9.9.98

REVENUE DEPT.
GL. No. 4247
IN. 17 JN
Oct 259

8

1899

From The Deputy Commr.
Tinnevelly District.

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Madras Revenue Board

Dated 9. 1. 99

Despatched 11" } January 99

Received

General No. 419.
No.

Enclosure No. 3 Waterfile
Government order
1551-3 dated 21st July 98
Ct 6 99

Submits the entire proceedings connected with the appeal petition of Jeevana Goundan, Ex-Periyathanakkaran (Municipal) of Valavanur

1877-97-9

16.1.99
RD on 17-1-99

(B) 17-1-99

Ct 6 99 relating to the subject is put up
18-1-99

To consult dr
18/1/99

No 119
Rec: 30th file

Deputy Commissioner's Office.
Tamukier District
Dated, Tamukier, 1st January, 189

To The Secretary to the Government
of Allegone, Generalised Revenue
Department

Sir,

I recalled for in Government
Order No: 951-8 of the 2/1st July 1898, I
Oct 26-98
have the honour to submit herewith
the entire proceedings connected
with the petition presented by
Jerome Jacob of Adarapore, Municipal
Taluk, appealing against the order
of this office rejecting his claim to
a building site at Adarapore.

2. The appeal petition and its
enclosures are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

M'Mahonigal
for Deputy Commissioner

AB

(10) Proceedings of the Govt Party was
Appt - Jawara Gowda & Respt Yalakki
Timma
" "
Read again :-

Govt Proceedings No 551-8
Pt 76-98
dated 20-7-98 remanding for
~~fresh disposal~~ to the Dy Commr
for a fresh decision
of Tumkur, the appeal of Jawara
Gowda of the village of Avaregere
Kunigal Taluk, regarding his
claim to a building site in the
said village

Read :-

(1) Petition of appeal No 341/A 14 of
1898-99 presented by Jawara
Gowda of Avaregere, Kunigal
Taluk, against the revised order
of the Dy Commr of Tumkur,
explaining that he directed the
registry of the building site
in question in the name of the
respondent on account of
his long possession and levied
a price for the occupancy
rupt under Rule XXX (A) of the L.R
Rules.

(2) The records received under
letter No 419 dy 9-1-99 from
the Deputy Commr Tumkur
Distt

No 7232-9/15 dy 11.4.99

Orders thereon

As the Deputy Commr

LR 77-97-98

Respt for appt
Shd be Sri Comville
dy 3/4/99

10991

Heard counsel.
C.R.

Reserve opinion
Pronounced on
Monday 19th
CRS
5/4/99

R 6/4/99

+ Pronounced 13/4 Sent 15/4/99

finds that the Respondent and his ancestors have been in possession of the site in dispute from time immemorial, the Respondent's present occupancy right cannot be disturbed. The Deputy Commr's order, confirming the Respondent's right is therefore, affirmed. The dispute between the Appellt and the Respts as to the ownership of the site in question is one which must be left to be adjudicated upon by a Civil Court.

2. It seems however to Govt that the Deputy Commr's order for the levy of the price of the site from the Respondent is illegal. Neither Sec: 55 of the Mysore L.R. Code nor Rule XXXA of the Rules framed thereunder applies to a case like this where it is admitted that the site is in the Respts lawful occupation or possession for more than 12 years and therefore is,

and (where?)
(has been?)

not the property of the Govt

C, + C₂ Draft for Secretary

3/4/44

To

The Deputy Commr

Tanjore Dist with

+ records

as comments after

DMS

+ 93-3-9-0 ಪಟ

15-4-99 ಪಟ್ಟಿ 25

(10)

1898-99

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

dated 14th April 1899

No. 7232-9
Pet. F. 6-98

Passing orders on the appeal of Javare-gauda of Avaregere, Kunigal taluk, against the Deputy Commissioner's order directing the registry in the name of respondent (Yalakki Timma) of a building site claimed by the appellant, and pointing out the illegality of the Deputy Commissioner's order in levying a price for the site from respondent.

SBP—25-4-99—200

Appellant.	Respondent.
Javaregauda.	Yāḷakki Timma.

READ AGAIN—

Government Proceedings No. 551-8—Pet. F. 6-98, dated 20th July 1898, remanding to the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur, for a fresh decision, the appeal of Javaregauda of the village of Avaregere, Kunigal taluk, regarding his claim to a building site in the said village.

READ—

(1) Petition of appeal No. 341—A. 14 of 1898-99, presented by Javaregauda of Avaregere, Kunigal taluk, against the revised order of the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur, explaining that he directed the registry of the building site in question in the name of the respondent on account of his long possession, and levied a price for the occupancy right under Rule XXX (A) of the Land Revenue Rules.

(2) The records received with letter No. 419, dated 9th January 1899, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur district.

No. 7232-9—PET. F. 6-98, DATED BANGALORE, 14TH APRIL 1899.

ORDER THEREON.—As the Deputy Commissioner finds that the respondent and his ancestors have been in possession of the site in dispute from time immemorial, the respondent's present occupancy right cannot be disturbed. The Deputy Commissioner's order confirming the respondent's right is, therefore, affirmed. The dispute between the appellant and the respondent as to the ownership of the site in question is one which must be left to be adjudicated upon by a Civil Court.

2. It seems, however, to Government that the Deputy Commissioner's order for the levy of the price of the site from the respondent, is illegal. Neither Section 135 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code nor Rule XXX (A) of the rules framed thereunder, applies to a case like this, where it is admitted that the site has been in respondent's lawful occupation or possession for more than 12 years, and is therefore not the property of the Government.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, with records

The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts.

(9)

15-4-99

ಇಂದು 8.4.95 ರಿಂದ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ

By Order

Dy. Secretary

For Secretary

8/4.

ಇವರನ್ನು ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯ ಆದೇಶದ
ಮೇರೆಗೆ ಹಾಗೂ ಇವರಿಂದ ಪಡೆದ
ಆಯ್ಕೆಯ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ನೇಮಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇಂದು 8.4.95. ರಿಂದ ಜಾ.ಗೆ.

By Order

For Secretary